DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 089 CS 505 522

AUTHOR Martin, Judith N.
TITLE The Relationship between Student Sojourner Perceptions of Intercultural Competencies and Previous Sojourn Experience.
PUB DATE 14 Nov 86
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Cultural Exchange; *Culture Contact; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; *Social Experience; Study Abroad; Tourism; Travel
IDENTIFIERS Cultural Adjustment; *Cultural Experience

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the relationship between self-perceived intercultural competence and previous intercultural experience among three groups of student sojourners. Subjects, 179 undergraduate intercultural communication students at a large midwestern university, and with varying degrees of intercultural experience (none; less than three months; and 3-12 months) completed an 18-item questionnaire measuring various cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of intercultural competence. The questionnaire dealt with four general areas of intercultural competence, drawn from previous literature. Results identified most clearly the cognitive and affective aspects of intercultural competence, less clearly the behavioral. Concerning the primary research question--the relationship between intercultural competence and previous sojourn experience--results suggest that the duration of the intercultural sojourn is related to self-reported competence in two cognitive dimensions: Awareness of Self and Culture, and the Ability to Facilitate Communication. These findings are consistent with previous research investigating outcomes of intercultural sojourns. (Data tables and an extensive bibliography are appended.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280089

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT SOJOURNER PERCEPTIONS OF INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCIES AND PREVIOUS SOJOURN EXPERIENCE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith N. Martin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Judith N. Martin
University of Minnesota
717 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, November 14, 1986

CS 505526

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between perceived intercultural competence and sojourn experience. Three groups of student sojourners with varying degrees of intercultural experience (none, less than three months, 3-12 months) completed an 18-item questionnaire measuring four general areas of intercultural competence, drawn from previous literature (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; Ruben, 1977).

In the first stage of analysis, sojourner ratings were submitted to factor analysis (Hull & Nie, 1975) which confirmed the four conceptual dimensions found in previous literature, with slight modifications: Awareness of Self and Culture, Awareness of Implications of Cultural Differences, Interpersonal Flexibility, and Ability to Facilitate Communication. The second stage of analysis involved construction of scales from the individual items and comparison of the three sojourner groups on ratings of their perceived competence on the four dimensions.

Analysis of variance tests revealed significant differences among the three groups of two of the four dimensions of intercultural competence. Followup multiple comparisons revealed that sojourners with the most intercultural experience (3-12 months) rated their ability significantly higher than those with no experience on : Awareness of Self and Culture, and Ability to Facilitate Communication. There were no differences on the other two dimensions.

As expected, additional analysis revealed that sojourners with more intercultural experience generally rated themselves higher in intercultural

competence than those with less or no experience. However, there was one exception; students with no previous experience rated themselves higher in Knowledge about their own cultural norms than those with experience. Also, sojourners with no experience rated themselves relatively high in all areas of intercultural competence.

These findings confirm recent conceptualizations of the cognitive and affective dimensions of intercultural competences and support recent findings that duration of sojourn experience is an important variable in sojourner outcomes of intercultural experience (Koester, 1985). Results are examined for implications for future research and application.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a great deal of discussion concerning the definition of intercultural competence and variables related to this competence. That is, scholars have attempted to identify competencies necessary for individuals to function effectively in an intercultural context, and have also proposed variables that influence those competencies. Unfortunately, there remains a lack of consensus on specific requisite skills and a dearth of empirical research investigating variables related to intercultural competence.

Attempts to empirically identify variables that are related to intercultural competence have been speculative, focused primarily on the prediction of overseas success for sojourner groups such as military or business personnel, Peace Corps, and technical assistance workers (Kealey & Ruben, 1983), or on the outcomes of intercultural sojourn experience for young adults (Sell, 1983). However, there has been little empirical evidence to confirm or disconfirm the proposed variables related to intercultural competence.

In an attempt to contribute to a growing body of empirical research investigating intercultural competence from a communication perspective, this study investigates the relationship between student sojourners' perceptions of their intercultural competence and one sojourner variable: previous intercultural experience. First, relevant literature is reviewed followed by a description of the study. Finally, implications of the results for future research and application are presented.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intercultural Competence

In his review of literature on intercultural competence, Dinges (1983) identifies six major approaches to intercultural competence: "Overseasmanship" (Cleveland, Mangone, & Adams, 1963), Isomorphic Attribution (Triandis, 1972, 1977a), "Multicultural Man" (Adler, 1982), Social Behavior and Learning (David, 1972; Guthrie, 1975), Typologists (Brislin, 1981; Nash & Shaw, 1963; Sewell & Davidson, 1956; Useem, 1966), and Intercultural Communication, the focus of this study.

In this field, scholars have examined intercultural competence in several ways. First, several scholars, most notably Porter and Samovar (1985) and Sarbaugh (1979) have identified psycho-social variables that affect intercultural communication, including social organization, roles and role prescriptions, thought patterns, organization of time and space, and world view. The assumption is that cultural differences in these variables affect communication. Therefore, understanding these differences facilitates intercultural communication. Others, such as Ruben (1976) have included communication behaviors in the definition of competence (e.g. display of respect, interaction posture, orientation to knowledge, empathy, role behaviors). Hawes & Kealey (1981) in their studies of the effectiveness of Canadian overseas development workers identified similar interpersonal skills: flexibility, respect, listening skill, trust, calm and self control, and sensitivity to cultural differences.

In one of the very few empirical studies, Hammer, Gudykunst and Wiseman (1978) identified three major factors of intercultural communi-

cation competence: Ability to deal with psychological stress, ability to communicate effectively, and the ability to establish interpersonal relationships. These data were based on returned sojourners' ratings of importance of 24 items of intercultural competencies. Abe and Wiseman (1983) replicated this study with Japanese tourists visiting the United States and recent debate has centered on the generalizability of these three factors, on whether the factors are culture-general or reflective only of U.S. sojourners' perceptions (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1984; Wiseman & Abe, 1984). It seems clear from this brief review of literature that additional empirical research is warranted to identify more precisely various dimensions of intercultural communication competence and to identify variables related to these dimensions.

While the intercultural competencies proposed in the literature seem disparate, it is helpful to categorize these various competencies according to a tripartite framework of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of intercultural competence suggested by several scholars (Paige, 1984; Triandis, 1977b):

1. Cognitive Skills (Knowledge about the target culture, knowledge concerning cultural differences and the impact of the differences on intercultural communication/ interaction.) Also included in this dimension is Self Awareness, particularly about one's beliefs and values, based on understanding one's own cultural norms.
2. Affective or personal Qualities (Tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility, empathy, ability to suspend judgement.)

3. Behavioral Competencies (Ability to solve problems created by cross-cultural differences, ability to form relationships, ability to accomplish tasks in an intercultural context.)

Outcomes of Intercultural Sojourn

A second related body of literature concerns the relationship between intercultural competence and previous intercultural experience. There has been a great deal of speculation on the benefits of an intercultural sojourn, particularly on young adult sojourners (Coelho, 1962; Abrams, 1965). Empirical research investigating the relationship between competencies and intercultural sojourn has focused primarily on cognitive aspects (increased knowledge of different cultures, increased worldmindedness, decreased ethnocentrism) as well as on personal growth (increased tolerance, autonomy, flexibility) of study abroad participants. Research in this area may also be categorized as focusing on the same dimensions described above: cognitive, affective, and behavior.

Cognitive Changes: Concerning the relationship between an intercultural sojourn and increased cognitive understanding of cultural difference, several studies have reported increased knowledge as a result of an intercultural sojourn. In a study of 39 former U.S. University of Gottingham students, Billingmeier and Forman (1975) reported that students, six years after the experience reported a "greater understanding of intellectual life and traditions of host country" and that some acknowledged increased awareness of differences between nations.

In a similar study of attitude change in an experimental group of 120 students in a 14-week study service term, Pfnister (1972 in Sell, 1983)

reported that the greatest change occurred in "the awareness of different philosophies, cultures and ways of life." There seems to be little contradictory evidence in this area and confirms intuition that an intercultural experience leads to greater cognitive awareness of cultural differences and increased knowledge about host culture.

Self-Awareness: Concerning the relationship between intercultural experience and the awareness of self and culture (also a cognitive dimension), there is speculation that an intercultural experience results in increased self and cultural awareness (Adler, 1975), but few studies have addressed this specifically. Abrams (1979) reported that 92 percent of the Antioch exchange students surveyed believed that the intercultural sojourn "challenged their perceptions of themselves and Americans" and intuitively, based on other research findings, one would expect that confronting new cultural patterns of beliefs and values would result in increased knowledge and awareness of one's own cultural identity.

Affective or Personal Qualities: Research investigating the relationship between interpersonal change and an intercultural sojourn has yielded contradictory results. On the one hand, in non-experimental studies, participants report personal growth as an outcome of an intercultural sojourn, i.e. "growth, independence, self-reliance and ability to make decisions on one's own" (Billingmeier & Forman, 1975) and in Pfnister's (1972) study, the second greatest change occurred in the "tolerance and understanding of other peoples and their views."

On the other hand, studies using experimental designs have yielded inconclusive results. Nash (1976) studied the effect of foreign study on 41 participants in a Junior Year Abroad program and found significant differences between overseas and control groups on increased autonomy, and

expansion or differentiation of self. No differences were observed on tolerance, increased self assurance and confidence. In a study of attitude change using pre- and post-tests on 18 members of a Geneva semester program, Price and Hensley (1979) found modest increases in tolerance for ambiguity (in Sell, 1983, p. 140).

In a study using 24 personality measures, McGuigan (1959) found that exchange program participants decreased their ethnic distance (prejudice) toward people significantly more than the stay at home group.

However, there are several studies reporting that intercultural sojourn experiences, at least for some participants, result in opposite outcomes, including: "more xenophic reactions and dependence" (McGuigan, 1959), reinforced appreciation of one's homeland at the expense of the nation visited (Kafka, 1968) and significantly less positive perception of the host country (Marion, 1974).

Sell (1983) suggests that the inconclusiveness of these results reflects the complexity of the relationship between intercultural sojourn and outcomes of the sojourn; that there are a number of intervening variables (type of contact while abroad, type of experience abroad, preexisting attitudes), and suggests that changes are measurable when these variables are incorporated into the research design. However, at this point, there is need to further investigate the relationship between aspects of personal growth (interpersonal flexibility) and intercultural experience.

Behavioral Competencies: Concerning the relationship between behavioral competencies and an intercultural experience, the behavioral measures used in previous research have generally been limited to "participation in internationally-oriented activities" (e.g. attending international

functions, sending letters abroad). Abrams (1979), investigating the effects of an intercultural sojourn on program participants, surveyed 424 Antioch college students and reported that former program participants were involved in more international activities, had more friends, professional colleagues, and acquaintances in other countries, read more books and newspapers in foreign languages than did those who remained on the home campus.

Likewise, Smith (1955), in an experimental study of the effects of an intercultural sojourn on attitude change, reported that on two measures of "internationally-oriented behavior" (correspondence with Europeans and gifts sent to Europe), there were changes in the experimental group and not the control groups. However, there have been no studies investigating the relationship between behavioral measures of intercultural competence as described earlier, i.e. in forming intercultural friendships, problem-solving in an intercultural context, or those behavior competencies described by Ruben (1977).

A very recent study conducted by Koester (1985) in cooperation with the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) revealed that type of experience and duration of experience are two critical variables. In the CIEE study, 3200 student sojourners in various programs were asked to rank outcomes of their intercultural experience (knowledge of the U.S. culture, more politically aware, academic performance, self confidence). Concerning the influence of length of stay on perceived impact, Koester reports, "The one to three month sojourn rendered the least significant results for changes...the three to twelve month time period seemed to produce the greatest impact on students... This time frame appears to represent the optimum length, less time produces less effect and more time rarely

produces even the same level of effect..." (p. 60).

In summary, while previous research provides some evidence that an intercultural sojourn leads to increased abilities in some areas of intercultural competence, there is very little empirical research on the relationship between an intercultural sojourn and intercultural competencies. Therefore, in an attempt to discover more about this relationship, this study poses the following research question:

What is the relationship between previous intercultural experience and perceived ability on selected intercultural competencies?

A secondary question concerns the duration of the intercultural experience. That is, what is the relationship between the length (duration) of the intercultural experience and the degree of perceived ability?

Rationale

The answers to these questions have a number of implications for researchers and trainers. First, the results concerning the intercultural competencies will contribute to our understanding of the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. The dimensions measured in this study include measures that have been proposed, but not measured empirically in previous research. Secondly, while the results of this study will not provide conclusive evidence on the outcomes of an intercultural sojourn per se, it will contribute useful information in one area of the continuing investigation of outcomes of an intercultural sojourn: the effects of a sojourn on perceived intercultural competencies.

METHODS

Participants

In an attempt to answer the research questions, we distributed an 18-item questionnaire measuring various cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of intercultural competence to 179 student sojourners. These students were enrolled in the undergraduate intercultural communication courses at a large midwestern university. These courses were designed for student sojourners, and the questionnaires were completed on the first day of class. The students were approximately 80 percent female and in four age groups. Eight percent (14) were 18-19, 45 percent (77) were 20-21, 27 percent (49) were 22-23 years old, and the remainder, 15 percent, were older than 23 years.

Approximately 20 percent (36) had no previous intercultural experience, 37 percent (65) had been abroad for less than three months, and 42 percent (74) had been abroad for more than three months. The majority of those with intercultural experience (60 percent) had been to Western Europe, about 25 percent to Latin and South America. The vast majority had been on University programs where they studied with other American students. 75 percent had returned less than six months prior to completing the questionnaire. Responses to a satisfaction item ("On a five-point scale, How satisfied are you with your experience?") indicated that 85 percent were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their intercultural experience.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire measuring intercultural competence contained 18

items in the four general dimensions described above: Cognitive dimensions: Awareness of self and culture (4 items), Knowledge concerning cultural differences (7 items); Affective: Interpersonal flexibility (5 items), and Behavioral competencies (2 items). Students were asked to rate their ability on each item on a five-point likert-type scale, with 5=very strong, 1=very weak. These items were generated to reflect competencies suggested in previous research, e.g., ability to identify U.S. cultural norms, ability to identify various cultural differences, ability to form intercultural friendships, etc. The items are listed in Table 4.

They were also asked to describe any other abilities they thought were important, and to supply information about themselves (age, gender, previous experience, location and duration of previous experience).

First, factor analysis were conducted on the student ratings of their abilities on the 18 items to confirm conceptual groupings of items. Secondly, composite indices (scales) were constructed from the factor scores and submitted to Analysis of variance tests to discover any significant differences among the three groups of student sojourners.

RESULTS

Dimensions of Intercultural Competence

In the first stage of analyses, the sojourners' ratings of their abilities were submitted to a factor analyses (SPSS subprogram FACTOR with equimax rotation, Hull & Nie, 1975) in order to confirm empirically the conceptual groupings of the competencies. Results of the factor analysis, presented in Table 1, confirmed the conceptual groupings, with slight modification. The behavioral items ("ability to form cross-cultural friendships," and "ability to solve problems in cross-cultural situations")

did not emerge as a separate factor. Rather, a fourth factor emerged, composed of three items previously in dimension 2 (Awareness of implications of cultural differences), and one behavioral item. Therefore, the factors reflect 3 cognitive and one affective dimension. These four factors accounted for 44 percent of the total variance and are described below.

Dimension 1 - Awareness of self and culture. This primary factor accounted for 59 percent of the explained variance (eigenvalue=4.32) and included four items: awareness of values, nonverbal, perceptual and linguistic norms of U.S. culture. Students were asked about U.S. norms, and items were phrased in this way because the great majority of students were from the dominant white, U.S. middle-class culture. This dimension is related to suggestions in the literature of the importance of knowing one's own cultural identity in interacting with culturally different others (Adler, 1975; Abrams, 1965).

Dimension 2 - Awareness of the implications of cultural differences accounted for 22 percent of the explained variance (eigenvalue=1.63) and included five items: ability to conceptualize a framework for understanding differences, ability to identify cultural differences in perception, nonverbal behavior, the ability to solve problems created by differences and the ability to identify stages of adjustment (which had a fairly weak loading of .38). This dimension is related to the ability to understand cultural variables influencing communication as proposed by Sarbaugh (1983) and Porter and Samovar (1985) and one's ability to attribute accurate meanings to others' behavior based on an understanding of these differences (Triandis, 1972, 1977a).

Dimension 3 -Interpersonal Flexibility accounted for 12 percent of the explained variance (eigenvalue=.85) and included five items: the ability to suspend judgement, to distinguish between cultural stereotypes and individuals, tolerate ambiguity, deal with different viewpoints, and a rather weak loading for "the ability to take the others' viewpoint" (empathy). As suggested earlier, this is a composite of a number of interpersonal qualities cited frequently in the literature on intercultural competence (Adler, 1975; Bennett, 1977; Barna, 1976; Ruben, 1977).

Dimension 4 - Ability to facilitate communication. This is a rather weak factor compared to the other factors, accounting for only 7 percent of the explained variance, with an eigenvalue of .53. Most sources suggest a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 to constitute a strong factor (Hull & Nie, 1975). The four items in this factor seem conceptually related to those in Dimension 2--the ability to identify cultural differences (values and language) and the ability to identify implications of these differences on interpersonal communication. However, the commonality seems to be the emphasis on linguistic/communication competence and suggests that understanding cultural differences in values and language have implications for the ability to communicate effectively, supporting Brein and David's (1972) emphasizing specifically the role of understanding differences and the importance of communication in effective intercultural adjustment and interaction. While there was one behavioral item, the factor seems to reflect the cognitive ability to understand cultural differences.

PUT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

In the second stage of analyses, respondents were divided into three groups according to the duration of their intercultural sojourn experience: Group 1 with no previous intercultural experience (N=36), Group 2 with less than three months experience (N=65) and Group 3 with more than three months experience (N=74).

Then scales were constructed from factor scores to represent the four dimensions of intercultural competencies (SPSS Subprogram FACTOR, Hull & Nie, 1975). Scores on these scales were submitted to SPSS Oneway analysis of variance to determine if there were significant differences among the three groups in their assessment of their abilities on the four dimensions (the dependent measure was the scores on the four dimensions), the independent measure was duration of previous experience (none, less than three months, 3-12 months). In the case of significant ANOVA results, followup multiple comparisons, Tukey Honestly Significant Differences, were computed to determine exactly where differences lay. The level of significance was set at .05.

Results of the Analysis of variance tests are present in Tables 2 and 3. As shown, there were significant differences among the three groups of sojourners for two of the four dimensions. For both dimensions, subsequent multiple comparisons reveal significant differences at the .05 level between Groups one and three. That is, those sojourners with the most intercultural experience (3-12 months) reported significantly higher ability than the group with no experience on: Awareness of Self and Culture, and the Ability to Facilitate Communication. There were no significant differences among the groups on Interpersonal Flexibility, nor on the Awareness of Implications of Cultural Differences.

PUT TABLES 2 and 3 ABOUT HERE

DISCUSSION

Intercultural Competencies

First, results of the factor analyses confirm, in part, earlier research investigating dimensions of intercultural competence. Two dimensions in this study (Interpersonal flexibility and the Ability to facilitate communication) seem most similar to factors identified in Hammer et.al. (1978). ("The ability to deal with psychological stress" [flexibility], "ability to communicate," and the "ability to establish interpersonal relationships"). The dimension "Awareness of Implications of cultural differences" also seems related to the factor identified by Abe and Wiseman (1983), "Ability to Understand others." These findings suggest that future research continue to incorporate cognitive aspects of intercultural communication when investigating intercultural competence; understanding and identifying differences in being effective in intercultural interaction (Porter & Samovar, 1985; Sarbaugh, 1979; Triandis, 1972, 1977a, 1977b).

While these findings focus primarily on cognitive and affective dimensions, it should be noted that behavioral competencies should be included in future definitions of intercultural competence (Dinges, 1983; Klemp, 1979; Ruben, 1976). Moreover, researchers should continue to identify more precisely and more comprehensively the competencies needed for intercultural functioning, by using a large number of subjects in varying roles and contexts and building on an empirical base of research that is being developed.

Relationship between Competencies and Sojourn Experience

Results concerning significant differences among the sojourners on the cognitive dimensions (Awareness of Self and Culture, Ability to facilitate Communication) are consistent with previous research results. Results indicate that for at least two dimensions of competence, sojourners' self-reported abilities are related to the duration of their previous sojourn experience. That is, those with 3-12 months experience are differentiated from those with no experience by the ability to identify norms in their own culture (linguistic, nonverbal, perceptual). While this has been speculated as an outcome of intercultural experience in previous literature (Abrams, 1965), there has been little empirical confirmation of this outcome. Therefore, this finding seems to confirm Adler's (1975) contention that the intercultural sojourn begins as a trip abroad, to discover a second culture, but ends in one's learning most about one's self and one's culture.

Sojourners with longer intercultural experience are also differentiated from those with no previous experience in their ability to identify cultural differences in several areas: language, values, and also the ability to identify implications of those differences for interpersonal communication (Ability to Facilitate Communication). This suggests that one outcome of the intercultural experience is increased awareness concerning cultural differences, confirming previous research investigating outcomes of study abroad experience (Billingmeier & Forman, 1975; Pfnister, 1972).

These two significant findings suggest that these competences are not reported after a relatively brief intercultural experience, since there were no significant differences between the sojourner group with less than three months experience and those with no experience. This is consistent

with earlier findings (Smith, 1955) and supports Koester's assertion that "the one to three month sojourn rendered the least significant results for changes...the three to 12 month time period seems to produce the greatest impact on students..." (p. 60). However, as she notes, future researchers should continue to specify the relationship between duration and outcomes by comparing students with varying lengths of sojourn experience (e.g., 6-9 mos., 9-12 mos.).

No significant differences emerged among the three groups on their reported ability in Interpersonal Flexibility (tolerance for ambiguity, empathy, distinguish between cultural stereotype and individual, ability to deal with different points of view, suspend judgement). This contradicts some suggestions in the literature that these competencies are outcomes of an intercultural experience (Pfnister, 1972; Price & Hensley, 1979), and adds to the contradictory evidence in this area discussed above, in the literature review.

One interpretation is that <u>perceived</u> outcomes are primarily cognitive rather than in the area of personal change, although there were no differences in the other cognitive dimension: the Awareness of Implications of Cultural Differences.

A second interpretation is that a change in the cognitive area is more easily identifiable than change in personal abilities. That is, it may be easier for sojourners to report they know something about various cultural differences than it is to identify abilities such as "tolerance for ambiguity," or "taking other person's viewpoint." This is supported by a suggestion that aspects of personal growth (vs. intellectual) are harder to assess as outcomes of intercultural sojourn (Sell, 1983; p. 132), and underscores the difficulty in general of measuring outcomes of intercul-

tural sojourn. The finding may also be due to the methodology (self report) in this study, and lends support for future researchers to attempt a variety of measures -- objective (behavioral) as well as subjective (self report) measures, when investigating outcomes of intercultural experiences or dimensions of intercultural competence.

Additional Findings

An examination of the mean scores on all the items in the questionnaire yield additional information concerning the relationship between perceived intercultural competences and intercultural sojourn experience (See Table 4). These mean scores reveal that sojourners could assess their own competencies and that their self-reported abilities directly increase with the amount of intercultural experience. This suggests a positive relationship between the two variables. Although there were few dramatic differences between the ratings of those sojourners with less than three months and those with more than three months experience, sojourners with more experience did rate themselves consistently higher in competencies than those with less experience.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

However, there was one exception. Sojourners with no experience rated themselves higher in their Awareness of Self and cultural Norms than sojourners with some experience. One explanation is that learning in this dimension (or an "increase" in ability) occurs in a different way than for other dimensions. That is, increased ability on this dimension means learning that the sojourner knows less than previously thought, before the

sojourn experience.

Secondly, it is interesting to note that student sojourners with no previous experience rated themselves fairly high in their abilities on the various competencies. The majority of the mean scores for this group were between 3.00 and 4.00, with several above 4.00 on a 5-point scale. That means that, before beginning a course on intercultural communication, students with no previous experience rated themselves as "adequate," "strong," or "very strong" in the various competencies. These findings have implications for practitioners who have described participants' resistance to intercultural training (Brislin, 1981, Paige & Martin, 1983). In this case, it seems that resistance to intercultural training may be based on an assumption, on the part of the participants, that they are already competent in intercultural skills. This may reflect a more general feeling that intercultural skills are based on common sense, something at which most people are proficient. In this study, these attitudes were also reflected in the students' responses to the request to identify additional competencies important in intercultural interaction.

Relationship between Maturation and Outcomes of Sojourn

An examination of the relationship between competencies and intercultural sojourn always raises the issue of maturation effects, that changes may be due to the maturing process rather than the intercultural sojourn. Various analyses were conducted to sort out the relationship between maturation and previous experience. The findings suggest that the differences in the sojourners' ratings of competencies was primarily influenced by their previous experience, rather than their age. An examination of the mean ratings on 3 X 4 (previous experience X age) tables

revealed that, in general, for all age groups, mean scores increased with the amount of sojourn experience, and did not necessarily increase with age. There were two exceptions. On item (ability to identify implications of cultural differences on communication), for one age group (22-23), ratings decreased with previous experience. On the other item, "ability to identify cultural differences in values," for sojourners with no experience, scores decreased with age. However, in general the difference in the scores seemed to be influenced by previous experience rather than age.

Certainly the relationship between maturation and intercultural competence is complex and has been addressed by few researchers (Dinges, 1983; Heath, 1977; Klemp, 1979). Future researchers should continue to address the issue and find ways to differentiate between maturation effects and experience effects when investigating outcomes of intercultural sojourns, particularly on young adults (Baty & Dold, 1977).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, results of this study confirm in part, earlier studies identifying conceptual dimensions of intercultural competence. Results identified most clearly the cognitive and affective aspects of intercultural competence, less clearly the behavioral. It was noted that these dimensions should be explored by future researchers to attempt to discover a comprehensive, appropriate conceptualization of what it means to be interculturally competent.

Concerning the primary research question, the relationship between intercultural competence and previous sojourn experience, results suggest that the duration of the intercultural sojourn is related to self-reported competence in two cognitive dimensions: Awareness of Self and Culture and

the Ability to Facilitate Communication. These findings are consistent with previous research investigating outcomes of intercultural sojourn.

First, the items in the Ability to Facilitate communication (ability to identify cultural differences in values, language) have been identified as an outcome of an intercultural sojourn for college students in previous literature. Also consistent is the lack of significant difference in the Affective dimension (Interpersonal Flexibility). This nonsignificant finding is one more difficult-to-interpret result in this area. Future researchers should continue to examine the relationships between the affective dimension of intercultural competence and the intercultural sojourn -- to attempt to resolve the discrepancy between anecdotal, qualitative research suggestions that this is an important outcome of an intercultural sojourn, and the contradictory and conflicting findings of empirical studies, including this one.

Finally, the significant differences for the Awareness of Self and Culture dimension confirm empirically the suggestion in the literature that the increased awareness of one's self and culture is an important outcome of an intercultural sojourn, but also leaves the puzzling nonsignificant finding on the final (cognitive) dimension -- Awareness of Implications of Cultural Differences.

While the findings confirm previous research to a certain extent, they also emphasize the need for continued research in the areas of conceptualizing intercultural competence and also in identifying outcomes of intercultural sojourn experiences.

REFERENCES

ABRAMS, I. (1965). The student abroad. In S. Baskin (Ed.), Higher education: some newer developments. New York: McGraw-Hill.

ABRAMS, I. (1979). The impact of Antioch education through experience abroad. Alternative Higher Education, 3, 176-187.

ABE, H. & WISEMAN, R. (1983). A cross-cultural confirmation of the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 7, 53-67.

ADLER, P. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15, 13-23.

ADLER, P. (1982). Beyond cultural identity: Reflections of cultural and multi-cultural man. In L. Samovar & & R. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

BARNA, L.M. (1976). Stumbling blocks in interpersonal intercultural communications. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

BATY, R. & DOLD, E. (1977). Cross-cultural homestays: An analysis of college students' responses after living in an unfamiliar culture. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1 (1), 61-76.

BENNETT, J. (1977). Transition shock: Putting culture shock in perspective. In N.C. Jain (Ed.), International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 4, 45-52.

BILLINGMEIER, R.T. & FORMAN, D. (1975). Gottingen in retrospect. International Review of Education, 21, 217-230.

BLALOCK, H. (1960). Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill.

BREIN, M. & DAVID, K. (1971). Intercultural communications and the adjustment of the sojourner. Psychology Bulletin, 76, 215-230.

BRISLIN, R.W. (1981) Cross-cultural encounters. New York: Pergamon Press.

CLEVELAND, H., MANGONE, G. & ADAMS, J. (1960). The overseas Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill.

COELHO, G.V. (1962). Personal growth and educational development through working and studying abroad. Journal of Social Issues, 18, 55-67.

DAVID, K. (1972). Intercultural adjustment and applications of reinforcement theory to problems of "culture shock." Trends, 4 (3), 1-64.

DINGES, N. (1983). Intercultural competence. In D. Landis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training Vol. 1. New York: Pergamon Press.

GUDYKUNST, W.B. & HAMMER, M. (1984). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: Culture-specific or culture general? International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8, (1), 1-10.

GUDYKUNST, W.B. & HAMMER, M.R. (1983). Basic training design: Approaches to intercultural training. In D. Landis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training Vol. 1. New York: Pergamon Press.

GUTHRIE, G. (1975). A behavioral analysis of culture learning. In R.W. Brislin, S. Bochner, & W.J. Lonner (Eds.), Cross cultural perspectives on learning. New York: Wiley.

HAMMER, M., GUDYKUNST, W. & WISEMAN, R. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2 (4), 382-393.

HAWES, F. & KEALEY, D.J. (1981). An empirical study of Canadian technical assistance: Adaptation and effectiveness on overseas assignment. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5, 239-258.

HEATH, D.H. (1977). Maturity & Competence: A transcultural view. New York: Gardner Press.

HULL, C.H. & NIE, N.H. (1975). Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

KAFKA, E.P. (1969). The effects of overseas study on worldmindedness and other selected variables of liberal arts students. (Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University), Dissertation Abstracts, 29, 481A.

KAGITCIBASI, C. (1978). Cross-national encounters: Turkish students in the U.S. International Journal of Intercultu2-ral Relations, 2 (2), 197-224.

KEALEY, D.J. & RUBEN,B.D. (1983). Cross-cultural personnel selection criteria, issues, and methods. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of Intercultural Training Vol. 4. New York: Pergamon Press.

KLEMP, G.O. (1979). Identifying, measuring, and integrating competence. In P. Pottinger & J. Goldsmith (Eds.), New directions in experiential learning: Defining and measuring competence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, no. 3., 41-52.

MARION, P.B. (1974). Evaluation of study abroad. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, Albuquerque, May. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED089 634).

McGUIGAN, F.J. (1959). Further study of psychological changes related to intercultural experiences. Psychological Reports, 5, 244-248.

MESTENHAUSER, J.A. (1983). Learning from sojourners. In D. Landis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of Intercultural Training Vol II. New York: Pergamon Press.

NASH, D. (1976). The personal consequences of a year of study abroad. Journal of Higher Education, 47, 191-203.

NASH, D. & SHAW, L.C. (1963). Personality and adaptation in an overseas enclave. Human Organization, 21, 252-263.

NETER, J. & WASSERMAN, W. (1974). Applied linear statis-

tical models. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

PAIGE, R.M. (1984). Trainer competencies: The missing conceptual link in Orientation. Paper submitted for publication to the International Journal of Intercultural Relations.

PAIGE, R.M. & MARTIN, J.N. (1983) Ethical issues and ethics in cross-cultural training. In D. Landis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of Intercultural Training Vol 1. New York: Pergamon Press, 36-60.

PFNISTER, A.O. (1972). Impact of study abroad on the American college undergraduate. Denver, Colorado: University of Denver, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 882).

PORTER, R. & SAMOVAR, L. (1985). Approaches to intercultural communication. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural Communication: A reader 4th Ed., Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

PRICE, B.L. & HENSLEY, T.R. (1978). The impact on French students of a study abroad program: The Kent State experience. Paper, Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association, Columbus, OH, April.

RUBEN, B. & KEALEY, D. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3(1), 15-47.

RUBEN, B.D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. Group and Organization Studies, 1, 334-354.

RUBEN, B. (1977). Human communication and cross-cultural effectiveness. International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 4, 95-105.

SARBAUGH, L.E. (1979). Intercultural communication. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden.

SELL, D.K. (1983). Research on Attitude change in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experience: Past findings and suggestions for future research. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7(2), 131-148.

SEWELL, W. & DAVIDSON, O. (1956). The adjustment of Scandinavian students. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 9-19.

SMITH, H.P. (1955). Do intercultural experiences affect attitudes? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 469-477.

TRIANDIS, H. (1972). The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley.

TRIANDIS, H. (1977a). Subjective culture and interpersonal relations across cultures. In L. Loeb-Adler (Eds.), Issues in cross-cultural Research. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 285, 418-434.

TRIANDIS, H. (1977b). Theoretical framework for evaluation of cross-cultural training effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 19-46.

USEEM, R.H. (1966). The American family in India. The Annals, 368, 132-145.

WISEMAN, R.L. & ABE, H. (1984). Finding and explaining differences: A reply to Gudykunst and Hammer. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8(1), 11-16.

Table 1

Factor Loadings for Intercultural Competency Items

Items	Dim 1	Dim 2	Dim 3	Dim 4
Factor 1 - Awareness of Self & Culture				
1. Ability to identify U.S. values	.69	-.02	-.09	.33
2. Ability to identify U.S. nonverbal norms	.60	.34	.07	-.05
3. Ability to identify U.S. norms of perception	.77	.07	.17	.03
4. Ability to identify U.S. linguistic norms	.64	.02	.02	.01
Factor 2 - Awareness of Implications of Cultural Differences				
5. Ability to identify a Conceptual Framework	.21	.50	.08	.19
6. Identify differences in perception	.11	.47	.20	.40
7. Identify difference in nonverbal norms	.02	.56	.16	.26
**8. Ability to solve problems created by cultural differences	.09	.54	.45	.06
9. Identify stages of adjustment	.09	.38	.13	.20
Factor 3 - Interpersonal Flexibility				
10. Ability to suspend judgement when confronted by cultural differences	.09	.08	.68	.15
11. Distinguish between cultural stereotype and individual	-.05	.04	.55	.20
12. Ability to take viewpoint of other (empathy)	.02	.37	.40	.09
13. Ability to tolerate ambiguity	.09	.30	.50	.18
14. Ability to deal with different points of view	.12	.14	.37	.10
Factor 4 - Ability to Facilitate Communication				
15. Ability to identify cultural differences in value	.06	.48	.01	.66
16. Identify cultural differences in language	.01	.02	.15	.46
17. Identify implications of differences in interpersonal communication	.19	.29	.27	.48
**18. Ability to form intercultural friendships	.01	.15	.29	.29

**Behavioral Items

Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Three Student Sojourner Groups on Awareness of Self and Culture (N-158)

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Groups	9.166	2	4.583	4.848	.009
Within Groups	147.477	15	.9453		
Total	156.633	158			

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Three Student Sojourner Groups on Ability to Facilitate Communication (N-158)

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Groups	9.585	2	4.792	4.983	.008
Within Groups	150.033	156	.962		
Total	159.617	158			

Table 4

Mean Scores on Perceived Intercultural Competencies and Related F-Statistics for Three Groups of Student Sojourners

Intercultural Competencies (5=very important, 1=very unimportant	Group 1 No exp (n=36)		Group 2 3 mos (n=65)		Group 3 3 mos (n=74)		
Items	x	s.d	x	s.d	x	s.d	F
Dimension 1 - Awareness of Self & Culture							
1. Identify U.S. values	3.89	(.67)	4.23	(.82)	4.11	(.78)	2.35
2. Identify U.S. non-verbal norms	4.00	(.63)	3.92	(.78)	4.09	(.74)	.95
3. Identify U.S. norms of perception	3.94	(.75)	3.80	(.97)	4.05	(.74)	1.59
4. Identify U.S. linguistic norms	4.28	(.66)	4.09	(.82)	4.22	(.73)	.83
Dimension 2 - Awareness of Implications of Cultural Differences							
5. Ability to conceptualize differences	3.00	(1.04)	3.23	(.81)	3.39	(.82)	1.63
6. Identify differences in perception	3.03	(.94)	3.28	(.88)	3.36	(.86)	5.52*
7. Identify differences in nonverbal	2.97	(.98)	3.26	(.91)	3.44	(.89)	3.20
8. Solve problems created by differences	3.17	(1.91)	3.34	(.76)	3.47	(.82)	1.63
9. Identify stages of adjustment	2.50	(.87)	2.97	(.85)	3.37	(.95)	11.99**
Dimension 3 - Interpersonal Flexibility							
10. Ability to Suspend Judgement	3.42	(.87)	3.55	(.90)	3.72	(.94)	1.40
11. Distinguish between stereotype & indiv.	3.42	(.77)	3.70	(.85)	3.82	(.73)	3.28
12. Take viewpoint of other (empathy)	3.22	(.87)	3.62	(.90)	3.57	(.97)	3.24
13. Tolerate ambiguity	2.97	(.89)	3.13	(.79)	3.25	(.99)	1.15
14. Deal with different points of view	3.75	(.60)	4.12	(.74)	3.97	(.81)	2.97
Dimension 4 - Facilitate Communication							
15. Identify cultural differences in values	3.00	(.97)	3.56	(.77)	3.71	(.70)	10.25**
16. Identify differences in language	3.17	(.94)	3.64	(1.00)	3.81	(.90)	5.65*
17. Identify implications of differences	3.17	(.91)	3.63	(.82)	3.67	(.78)	4.99
18. Form intercultural friendships	4.11	(.75)	4.06	(.93)	4.19	(.77)	.41

*p < .05

**p < .01